

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 056

32

RC 004 299

TITLE Report of Title I, ESEA, Migrant Coordinators Meeting.

INSTITUTION Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.

PUB DATE 4 Dec 68

NOTE 24p.; Migrant Coordinators Meeting (Washington, D.C., December 4 - 6, 1968)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.30

DESCRIPTORS Administrator Guides, *Conference Reports, *Disadvantaged Groups, Economically Disadvantaged, *Educational Legislation, Educational Planning, Interagency Planning, *Migrant Education, Program Coordination, *State Federal Aid

ABSTRACT

One hundred and three persons, including 77 state coordinators and administrators representing 43 states, attended a 1966 migrant education meeting sponsored by the U. S. Office of Education. The primary objective of the meeting was to find ways to improve the effectiveness and quality of educational programs for children of migratory agricultural workers. Other specific objectives of the conference were (1) to review state administrative requirements and discuss methods of strengthening state responsibility; (2) to expand further the programs of interstate cooperation as they pertain to the migrant child and his family; (3) to promote more extensive interagency cooperation by familiarizing the new state coordinators with those agencies having responsibility for services to the migrant family; and (4) to discuss practical approaches and techniques involved in the implementation of an interstate system for transfer of records. This report summarizes the major addresses presented and the recommendations by the states to the Office of Education for future action on behalf of migrant children. A list of chairmen of the discussion groups, the participants, the speakers, and consultants is appended. (Author/TL)

ED039056

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

REPORT

OF TITLE I, ESEA, MIGRANT COORDINATORS MEETING

December 4 - 6, 1968

Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Robert H. Finch, Secretary

Office of Education
Peter P. Muirhead, Acting Commissioner

Re 004299

INTRODUCTION

One of the major strengths of the U.S. Office of Education's program for children of migratory farm workers is the excellent cooperation that exists between the States and OE, among the States themselves, and among the many cooperating agencies which also deal with the migrant problem.

To strengthen further this bond, the Office of Education invited State representatives and other interested persons from universities and public and private agencies to participate in a migrant education meeting in Washington, D.C., December 4-6, 1968. One hundred and three persons attended, including 77 State coordinators and administrators representing 43 States.

The conferees met to review the legislation (the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-10 as amended by Public Law 89-750) and to learn from representatives of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor current thinking on Capitol Hill.

The primary objective of the meeting was to find ways to improve the effectiveness and quality of educational programs for children of migratory agricultural workers.

Other specific objectives of the conference were: To review State administrative requirements and discuss methods of strengthening State responsibility; to expand further the programs of interstate cooperation as they pertain to the migrant child and his family; to promote more extensive interagency cooperation by familiarizing the new State coordinators and administrators with those agencies having responsibility for services to the migrant family; and to discuss practical approaches and techniques involved in the implementation of an interstate system for transfer of records.

This report summarizes the major addresses presented to the States and the recommendations by the States to the Office of Education for future action on behalf of migrant children. The chairmen of the discussion groups, the participants, the speakers, and consultants are identified in the appendix. The program and the letter of commendation to members of the Interstate Record Transfer Committee are also included.

SPEECHES AND REPORTS

John F. Hughes, Director of the Division of Compensatory Education,
Office of Education.

The Title I migrant education program works with a "fairly well-defined population." Title I itself centers on a particular group of children--those from low-income families. The migrant program is even more specialized; it deals with low-income families on the move.

The children of migratory farm workers are heavily penalized and badly in need of help. They suffer from the ills and deprivations of poverty, and their way of life is a disappearing one. Our obligation is not only to serve the educational needs of these children now but to provide them with occupational options for the future.

We need to provide the kind of educational opportunity that will give migratory children a fair chance for success in life. That is the explicit mission of this program. It is fitting that we acknowledge the special support that the program has received not only from the Congress and its committees and their staffs (who work very hard in behalf of this group of children), but also from the various organizations that have labored over the years to bring to public attention the necessity for providing the children with improved services.

Unlike much of the legislation that awaits the new Congress, the Title I migrant education program is solidly on the books for fiscal 1970. The Congress has shown that despite the general shortage of funds for Federal programs, it intends to grant special consideration to the needs of migrant children.

The Title I program is now well into its operational phase. We have started arrangements for training and for the design of programs and curriculums. But there is still the problem of evaluation. Those of us who were in it from the beginning were very grateful to the Congress for putting an evaluation requirement into the law. Nonetheless, there have been many days when the application of this requirement has entailed a great deal of effort. It has been hard to get meaningful information that will convince people that the programs are indeed serving the children and, further, hard to use that information in ways that will benefit the children.

Evaluation puts us in the limelight. We are no longer in a private classroom conducting a private activity; we are in the open where everyone can see how we are working with the children and the impact we are having on them. Therefore, all of us--Federal, State, and local educational agencies, teachers and administrators--are accountable for the results. For this reason, we are constantly on the alert for ways in which we can identify the kinds of services and the kinds of programs that will best benefit the children.

It behooves us to look very critically at what we have done, to vow to do better with the additional funds that are available to us this year, and to use the evaluation information to redesign programs that serve children more effectively.

The Office of Education recognizes its responsibility to feed back evaluation information as rapidly as possible to the educational community and to reflect this information in its guidelines and criteria.

In concentrating on ways in which the quality of our programs can be improved, we have found:

1. That programs for deprived children will not be useful unless we find ways and means to involve effectively their parents and families.
2. That most parents have a deep love and affection for their children, and do care about what happens to them.

It is time we drew parents into our programs. Program Guides 46 and 46A express the position of OE on this matter.

Beyond that, the Commissioner of Education has issued a new policy guide on the ways in which programs can be most effective. It is dated November 20, 1968, and numbered 48. It says Title I funds and services should be concentrated on those children with the greatest needs in ways which can produce the greatest academic achievement. We are not going to get results unless we focus intently on the children we are serving.

Our program criteria (Program Guide No. 44, March 1968) present the latest guidelines for Title I. They should be followed carefully by administrators of migrant programs.

In the weeks and months ahead you will hear much from the Office of Education about the things that ought to be done to improve programs. We urge you to use not only Title I funds but other funds that may be available to communities to improve the functioning of teachers. We need teachers who really understand, who empathize with the migrant population. This kind of teacher is still a pretty rare thing in our schools, yet is the kind of teacher we are seeking.

Again, other funds, certainly the Education Professions Development Act funds, can be used to train and retrain teachers and other professionals, adults, and volunteers in this program.

The emphasis in migrant programs thus far has been on the younger children. We are serving, predominantly, children in the elementary grades. Funds have been limited, and working at this age level probably makes a good deal of sense. It helps to prevent the kind of deficiencies that otherwise pile up and plague our remedial efforts. But hundreds of thousands of migrant children are at the secondary level, and we have a responsibility to them, too.

#

B. Alden Lillywhite, Deputy Associate Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Education.

Many different programs of the Office of Education directly relate to the migrant program. I cite particularly the new bilingual education bill which has now been funded for \$7.5 million and the dropout prevention program with its newly appropriated budget of \$5 million.

Besides these BESE programs, there are funds available from the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development and the possibility of using vocational education funds for older migrant children.

At this time, we are particularly concerned with the quality of performance, evaluation, and dissemination of your programs. The process of evaluation is exceedingly difficult, complicated, time-consuming, and elusive. Yet, if I were in the Congress, I would tell an agency that unless it could tell us how it works and what it is doing, we wouldn't fund it any more.

A report is due to Congress by January 31 of each year, in connection with the advance funding.

A final thing . . . the Bureau hopes that you put into effect the mechanism to establish the uniform record system. The Bureau supports this kind of activity to the limit and will give what technical assistance we can in helping frame it and helping make it work.

#

Thomas Boyd, Legislative Assistant to the Hon. Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Senator from New Jersey and Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

In a recent survey by the Subcommittee, two questions were asked: What are the statistical dimensions of your program for the fiscal year 1968 and the projection for fiscal 1969? and What are the unmet needs of migrant education?

The questionnaire was sent to all coordinators in the cooperating States; 35 responded.

Information from this survey, compiled in summary form, will appear in the annual report of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor and in a special committee print on migrant education.

From the answers received to date, the No. 1 program need is the record transfer system.

The next highest mention was for expansion of programs to include the children of unemployed agricultural workers and seasonally employed workers who do not migrate.

Third on the list of needs was adult or parental involvement in the educational process. All the gains in the classroom or in the camps are lost when a home environment does not reinforce educational activities or when the parents have the wrong attitude.

Fourth, some bilingual and bicultural tests, diagnostic devices, and curriculum materials drawn from the migrant experience. There are projects under way to draft some of these materials, but these still should be high on the list.

Fifth, a new formula for computing the number of eligible students for whom a State can receive funds.

Sixth, an improvement in the quality of home life, specifically in terms of sanitation, nutrition, and basic standards of living. The educator cannot become responsible for the home life of the student, but he can't ignore it.

Seventh, strengthened child-labor laws to keep children out of the fields and in school.

Eighth, more funds for preschool children--0 to 3 years--taking up the day-care function that was formerly the role of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). The things that do or do not happen from birth to age 3 can set the pattern for a child's educational growth and development.

Ninth, earlier notice of project approval coupled with long-term funding. This is needed so programs will have more continuity.

Tenth, better interstate coordination, exchange of teachers, techniques, and recommendations. The States that work in a migrant stream and share students should do more coordinating.

Some of you mentioned funds held out of the regular Title I allocation for administrative purposes, for implementation, conferences, dissemination of information, planning, site visits, and so forth.

And finally, the reports urged specific programs to end migrancy, to pull the children out of the stream and stop them from being migrants. The migrant farm worker is in a process of phase-out. There needs to be some thinking along these lines. What will education mean to children who will soon leave the migrant stream?

Throughout, the responses reflected a need for a changing philosophy toward migrant education, an extension of Title I services, and for follow-through, check-back, and follow-up education for a period of several years after the child leaves the stream.

What kinds of professional services do you need from the Office of Education? You have said several times that you need professional help. Why don't you fill in the blanks and tell them exactly what you need?

Is there any work being done now on the new skills and attitudes that teachers of migrants will have to develop? There is some inservice training being done, but many of you mentioned teacher training as an unmet need. We need to have indepth programs for all teachers of migrant children.

Finally, do any of you have difficulty in coordinating various kinds of Federal resources--OEO, Labor Department, and so on? Are there any other things you might do to use the other resources of the Federal Government to help you teach migrant children?

In your responses, you indicated a keen interest and desire to work in these areas, and as long as we are on the job we will help you as best we can.

#

Boren Chertkov, Associate Counsel to the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

I strongly urge you educators to become involved in the legislative process. If Congress is going to pass legislation that is going to be meaningful, this has to happen.

Each year the subcommittee issues a report. It is a comprehensive document, citing the need for legislation and continuing program needs. I highly recommend this report to anyone who wants a general picture of the migrant farm labor program. Copies are available.

Health care -- The Migrant Health Act of 1962 was a significant first step in getting health care to migrants. We still spend only \$12 a year on the health of each migrant compared to over \$200 for the average citizen. In 1968 we got an extension for 2 years for appropriations, but we have since learned that the program is in danger. The migrant health unit may be reorganized out of existence and put in with other health problem areas, such as narcotics, alcohol, and urban health, which means a lesser emphasis on the problems of migrant health.

Housing -- The Labor Department has enacted some standards for housing. This is an important first step, but it is questionable how strong the standards are and how meaningful the enforcement is. There also are OEO housing programs that touch the migrants. This year we intend to try to do an evaluation of the impact of these programs. Most OEO officials readily admit that it is seasonal farmers to whom the OEO money goes and not necessarily the migrants.

Wages -- A minimum wage law was passed in 1966 but inflation probably took away any actual benefits that may have come from it. Yet, in certain areas where wage rates were averaging 90 cents an hour, it is encouraging although it's not based on a full year of work. This year we hope to work on unemployment insurance. It's been suggested that one of the best areas to try annual income supplement would be with the migrant workers. They have the desire to work, they want to work, but they can't always get work. There are a number of insurance-type programs that exclude migrant workers: Social Security, workmen's compensation, and a long list of others that debar all farm workers.

These exclusions might be lifted if the Supreme Court should find that they are unconstitutional burdens. This is, however, doubtful.

This year, hopefully, we are going to be getting into some new areas of rural poverty. We will look into the extent to which rural community

development can be used to relieve the plight of migrant farm workers when there are no longer jobs for them.

This, then, is what the subcommittee is working on. We will be proposing in the 91st Congress a package of 10 to 12 bills. The most important is going to be collective bargaining--giving these workers the opportunity to form unions and bargain with their employers.

#

Dr. Albert J. Riendeau, Special Assistant to Dr. Grant E. Venn, Associate Commissioner for the Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Library Programs, Office of Education.

I myself am a product of a migrant worker movement of a past era. My father was born in Taunton, Mass., migrated to Canada, met and married my mother, and settled down. At the age of 16 I migrated to the United States to work in the fields. Even at that age I found migrant farm work a rough way to make a living. I therefore chose education as a way out of my dilemma.

Educationally disadvantaged children of migrant workers today look toward a future which holds much more promise than the one I faced 30 years ago.

Now, I'd like to discuss Public Law 90-576, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. Sylvia Porter, in referring to this piece of legislation in her column, recently wrote: "It is possible that the biggest boost for vocational education in history is hidden in the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments."

The new Act not only strengthens existing programs, but provides for new ones designed specifically to equip slum youths, disadvantaged youths and adults, and handicapped persons with both employability and job skills.

Vocational funds should now become available for use in programs to serve all youngsters. A student need not decide to become a vocational enrollee to gain benefits from them. The Act permits courses for only one semester--or orientation for occupations at the elementary and junior high school levels. It also focuses on the dropout problem and the problem of high youth unemployment, providing earmarked funds for these areas.

Special funds also are provided for the development of new programs in areas that presently do not have specific vocational education. These would include emerging occupations in the new human services field and in the technical fields. In addition, there are specific provisions for vocational education for handicapped children. The Act also provides

expanded support for a realistic partnership between business, industry, and education--where students may be in school part time and at work part time as a normal phase of their educational process.

Public Law 90-576, the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, provides a way to bring about the required changes in our school programs. It is designed to help the "hard-to-reach" and "hard-to-teach." How can it bring about these changes?

For one thing, it authorizes more than double the current appropriations for the regular State grant programs, making possible great expansion of vocational education programs and a good start on many new programs. These grants are generally on a 50-50 matching basis.

State plan requirements are specified for programs designed to insure that training for career vocations is available to all who need it or desire it. Standards for preparing and approving State plans are strengthened and States must prepare annual and long-range plans and evaluations.

Because the new Act calls for an annual State plan that not only covers the current year but also the succeeding 4 years each time it is submitted, it is going to help provide for long-range planning development and evaluation. Each plan must be presented in a public hearing for people throughout the State as well as to members of the State Advisory Committee. Thus, more ideas and more talents will be brought to bear on State plans.

Another important point: The new Act authorizes \$40 million in additional funds for fiscal years 1969 and 1970 for special programs for the disadvantaged. No State matching is required for these programs which are designed for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular program.

In addition, beginning with fiscal year 1970, emphasis on vocational education programs for the disadvantaged, the handicapped, dropouts, and the youthful unemployed is assured by earmarking specific percentages of State allotments for these purposes.

The 1968 Act also makes provisions for constructing and operating residential vocational schools for youths 15 to 21 years of age. It authorizes funds to be used by the Commissioner of Education to make grants directly to State boards, colleges and universities, and public education agencies for this purpose. In addition, it authorizes the States to plan, construct, and operate residential vocational education facilities--with the Federal share of the cost set at a maximum of 90 percent. It also authorizes such sums "as may be necessary" for making annual grants to reduce the cost of borrowing for the building of residential schools and dormitories.

By taking disadvantaged youths out of their slum environments, residential schools could effectively train them in both employability and job skills in an atmosphere conducive to learning.

The new legislation also authorizes appropriations for cooperative vocational education programs.

Cooperative work-study programs offer many advantages in preparing young people for employment. Through such programs, a meaningful work experience is combined with formal education enabling students to acquire knowledge, skills, and appropriate attitudes. They remove the artificial barriers which separate work and education and, by involving educators with employers, create interaction whereby the needs and problems of both are made known. This makes it possible for occupational curriculums to be revised to reflect current needs in various occupations.

The Act provides for financial assistance for personnel to coordinate such programs and to provide instruction related to the work experience; also to reimburse employers when necessary for added costs incurred in providing on-the-job training and supervision.

In addition to cooperative work experience programs, the Act authorizes funds for work-study programs. These will enable schools to give needy youths taking vocational education courses and unemployed youthful dropouts enrolling in vocational programs part-time employment in public institutions or agencies. Although these jobs may not necessarily be relevant to their classroom work, they will make it financially possible for youths between the ages of 15 and 21 to remain in school and to learn good work habits.

Many of our most vexing dilemmas have resulted from changes in the nature of work. Old jobs are disappearing or being altered; new ones are emerging. Relocation of industry and shifts in market demands have further complicated the labor market. In addition, jobs for which physical strength and untrained minds were sufficient have drastically declined, while jobs requiring specific skills and advanced learning have greatly increased.

These are the reasons the Administration proposed new vocational education legislation to the 90th Congress and the reasons we have this new mandate from Congress.

One of the new Act's most important provisions, in my opinion, is the authorization of some \$222 million in the next 4 years for pilot programs and projects. Half of this sum may be used by the Commissioner to pay all or part of the costs of projects that will create what the law calls "a bridge between school and earning a living for young people, who are still in school, who have left school either by graduation or dropping out, or who are in post-secondary programs of vocational preparation," and for promoting cooperation between public education and manpower agencies. The remaining 50 percent may be used by State boards for making grants to local education agencies to pay all or part of the costs of developing and operating exemplary occupational education programs.

These exemplary programs call for imaginative new approaches to vocational education. They should include those designed to familiarize elementary and secondary school students with the broad range of occupations for which special skills are required and the requisites for careers in such occupations; those providing students with educational experiences through work during the school year or in the summer; and those calling for intensive occupational guidance and counseling during the last years of

school and for initial job placement. I believe schools should be given the responsibility of obtaining an entry job for every student who is not college-bound, just as in the past they have been responsible for getting academic graduates into college.

It might be well to consider a few examples of exemplary programs which might have relevancy for the migrant child.

1. We have been hearing a great deal about individualizing education lately. It is a technique that tailors instruction to the pupil. At a conference in Washington, D.C., 2 weeks ago, the Duluth Public Schools put on a classroom demonstration using children from the Washington schools, which was most convincing. For 3 days they demonstrated to standing-room-only crowds of teachers, administrators, board members, and interested citizens that the traditional classroom with a stern schoolmarm at one end and neat rows of quiet pupils facing her was soon to be replaced by something more palatable for students. The Oakleaf Elementary School, just outside Pittsburgh, has been testing and refining individually prescribed instruction during the past 3 years. This system would appear to hold a great deal of promise for the migrant child.

2. Changing attitudes of parents as well as children is a most challenging task. Denver's ETV station has developed several soap operas about "the Valdezes and the Donahues, typical Spanish-American and Negro families who would be at home in Denver's inner city." While the roles are based on the lives of typical residents of Denver, they are slightly idealized so that the viewers can identify easily. The episodes offer plenty of warmth, laughter, and sadness and a little lesson is woven into each scene.

The format was decided upon after a survey of 600 residents of one of Denver's public housing projects revealed that most of the households preferred soap operas on television. A grant from the Office of Education made it possible to employ a professional writer and eight 30-minute soap operas were produced and aired over KMRA-TV, Denver's ETV channel.

3. "Training moms to be better teachers" is another example of exemplary projects which is receiving wide attention. Headed by the George Peabody College for Teachers and the Demonstration and Research Center for Early Education (DARCEE), the project searches for ways to overcome the educational disadvantages that plague children from impoverished homes.

Mothers are encouraged to remain at school after taking their pre-school-age child to school to observe how professional educators "manage" their children. Hidden

by a one-way mirror, the mother can quietly observe the teacher at work. After a few months of observation and coaching by the teacher, the mother moves into the classroom and works with the children. Similar techniques will get younger children off to a better educational start at home.

There are several known variations of this plan. All of them are aimed at discovering which methods most effectively educate disadvantaged children.

4. In Norwalk, Conn., a high school fully accredited by the State has a student body consisting exclusively of dropouts who want to learn a job skill. Its entire enrollment is made up of what educators call "school alienated" youth--the almost 30 percent of America's students who probably won't make it through high school.

The only such job training program in the country operated as part of a school system, Norwalk's Center for Vocational Arts is a place where dropouts come to learn the skills to get a job. The program is unique in that it reflects Norwalk's concern that the school system should be responsible for all students.

"They can get a certificate as soon as they've learned a skill," says Forrest E. Parker, acting director of the unusual school. "Their work is based on competence, not on sitting in a seat for a certain period of time."

5. Last year, Gov. Winthrop Rockefeller of Arkansas asked Prof. J. Clark Davis, University of Nevada, to conduct a study which might lead to improving conditions for the disadvantaged. The use of mobile facilities to upgrade work skills of rural low-income wage earners was recommended. It was proposed that this mobile unit move into rural areas of Arkansas, enabling people to learn marketable skills to which they quite possibly might not be introduced through more traditional educational media.

I could cite many other fine examples of exemplary programs which are deliberate efforts to "get at" some of our sticky problems, but I'm sure you have examples of your own. The point is, Public Law 90-576 encourages innovation and will provide funds to support such programs if you are willing to give them a try. We must come up with new ideas for keeping minority group children in school and to see that as many as possible develop a salable skill.

#

Mrs. Genevieve O. Dane, Chief, Operations Branch of the Division of Compensatory Education, Office of Education.

No one is concerned with the legislative formula for the allocation of funds until the time comes when the allocation is less than what was anticipated. Then people begin to question the legislative formula.

The total number of migrant children counted for allocation purposes has decreased each year since the first year of the program when we started counting.

This year it is fully funded again and there is a change in the formula. The rate at which we pay is either the State or national average per pupil expenditure, whichever is greater, so the higher rate helps to offset the impact of the reduction in the number of children. It doesn't help all of the States because the reduction in the number of children in some States is too great and hence these States take a sharp decrease in allocation.

The formula reads this way, and there are some key words in it -- the estimated number of such migrant children, aged 5-17 inclusive, who reside in the State full time and the full-time equivalent of the estimated number of such migrant children who reside in the State part time, as determined by the Commissioner.

No Federal agency collected data on numbers of migrant children so there were no data available. The Congress was aware of this so the formula was written to include the word "estimated" and the words "as determined by the Commissioner."

The intent is to pay an annual rate for a child who is full time in a State. We do not pay an annual rate on behalf of a child who is in a State for 2, 3, or 4 months. It is the full-time equivalent we pay the annual rate for, so that is why the topic title is "Full-time Equivalency."

Since there were no data available on the number of migrant children the words in the law "as determined by the Commissioner" presented a problem to us. The only statistics we have are those obtained from the Department of Labor, and these statistics represent workers rather than children. We obtain statistics from the Department of Labor on interstate and intra-state employment by month. We add them up and divide by 12 to arrive at the average or full-time equivalent of migrant workers. In addition, the number of interstate migrant referrals are reported to us, together with the approximate number of months at home base. These statistics are also connected to full-time equivalents. We still do not have the number of children. This was set arbitrarily at .75 per worker. The total full-time equivalent of migrant workers is then multiplied by .75 to derive the number of migrant children.

Many education programs require the use of census data in determining State allocations. Title I of ESEA is the only program where numbers of children are counted annually. Programs which use census data are revised only every 10 years.

We are open to suggestions as to how data can be collected on numbers of migrant children on a consistent nationwide basis and on a timely basis so that allocations can be made promptly at the beginning of a fiscal year. Thus far, we have not been able to devise a procedure which would be any better than the procedure we are now using.

We are also open to suggestions for establishing a new formula which would be fair to all States and in keeping with the intent of the legislation. Please give serious consideration to positive, constructive proposals. If you can come up with a better formula, we will be happy to receive it.

#

Randall F. Clemens, Senior Program Specialist in the Migrant Programs Section, Division of Compensatory Education, Office of Education.

About \$37 million, or 90 percent of the migrant education allocation under Title I, was used in fiscal 1968 by 44 of the 47 eligible States which participated.

Eight States contracted with universities or were using their own State personnel to conduct indepth surveys. Eleven States had programs bringing services to the migrant community by the use of some 20 mobile units. About 240 portable classrooms were purchased, or leased, to alleviate space problems. Food and health services were included in practically all programs. More than 3,000 aides assisted in the programs. In many cases, aides were bilingual, to achieve greater results and alleviate the shortage of bilingual teachers.

Approximately \$7 million was planned for English-as-a-second-language (ESL) programs. Approximately 228,000 children were expected to participate, as follows: 23.4 percent in the preschool area, 61.3 percent elementary, 14 percent secondary, and 1.3 percent in ungraded areas.

Money went for instructional supplies; administration; construction and remodeling, including portables; equipment; health services; food; transportation; fixed charges; operation; and maintenance costs.

In reviewing State programs, some general observations may be made:

We must have a common understanding of the definition of a migrant child and an acceptance of this definition. Perhaps the definition needs broadening.

Regarding interstate and interagency cooperation--I would like to urge each of you to be more specific in your reports on this matter. You say you participate, but don't tell us how. Perhaps you are not digging deep enough into this area--not soliciting the sources available in the community, police, service clubs, churches, and so forth.

About 86 percent of your effort is spent on preschool and the elementary grades, with only 14 percent being devoted to the children who are dropping out or not being covered above the elementary level. It's a serious problem. The older children are the hardest group to reach. We'd like to see a little more effort here.

One of the major responsibilities of a program coordinator at the State level is that of public relations. To say that a local school board, or superintendent, will not allow you to have a program in his district is all right. We are sensitive to the problems you have politically--and otherwise--in your State. However, you have to be a supersalesman if you are going to do the job for your migrant children.

By now we should know where we're going and what road we're going to take. We know what services you are attempting to provide, to whom and what you want to do with them. In some cases we need a little reassessment--to take a good look, for example, at the value of the short-term structured summer schools. We feel that in your narratives you are not giving us enough description of your teacher and teacher aide training programs. We like to know that you are having them, but we need to know how you are conducting them and what you are doing. What is the relationship of the equipment to the programs that you are offering? These are some of the things we'd like to know.

#

Joseph P. Bertoglio, Senior Program Specialist in the Migrant Programs Section, Division of Compensatory Education, Office of Education.

The current form used to evaluate the migrant education program does not produce all the pertinent data needed by the Washington office. To improve the quality of the reporting system, the Migrant Programs Section is revising the form to be used for the 1969 evaluation period.

The main strength of the program--as reported by the States and from the Office of Education's observations--lies in its instructional components. Most often mentioned as successful are:

1. Library services
2. Individualized instruction
3. Ungraded team-teaching classes
4. Adult education

5. Instructional mobile vans
 - a. Vocational education
 - b. Academic instruction
 - c. Study halls
6. Parent program planning
7. Inservice training
8. Teacher aides
 - a. Paraprofessional
 - b. Nonprofessional
9. Medical and dental services
10. Language development
11. Preschool instruction
12. Vocational education
13. High interest - low vocabulary instruction
14. Unit teaching
15. Bilingual instruction
16. Language arts through drama
17. Recreation and physical education

Program components which indicated weakness, or which were entirely lacking, were as follows:

1. Adequate testing and diagnostic materials
2. Day-care centers
3. Scholastic and health record transfer
4. Migrant population identification
5. Lack of qualified personnel
6. Parent involvement limited
7. Curriculum adjustment
8. Late allocation of funds
9. Segregated classrooms
10. Lack of evening programs
11. Bilingual paraprofessionals (shortage)
12. Lack of local facilities
13. Lack of acculturation classes
14. Local school board apathy
15. Social organizations for young migrants
16. Imaginative programs for teenagers
17. Lack of full-time coordinators
18. Lack of coordination between local service agencies and programs for migrants.

#

Leo R. Lopez, Chief of the Bureau of Community Services of the California State Department of Education and Chairman of the Record Transfer Committee.

Prior to the passage of the migrant education amendment to Title I, some States tried to get recordkeeping started. A committee was set up in Phoenix in February 1966, and this committee was given the responsibility of developing and bringing together all the States to set up a record transfer system of whatever nature was needed. Being wise people, too, they decided to develop a system that everybody would understand.

The committee has accomplished the first phase of its responsibility. It has come up with a record transfer system to be performed manually and also to be transformed into a data-processing approach. Everybody should by now have a copy of the record transfer manual which gives instructions for the operation of the system.

A form has been devised and submitted to the Office of Education. The committee has also prepared instructions for the use of the form.

The form and the instructions--everything--should be ready to put into use by the first of the year--at least the manual operation of it. The committee will continue functioning, hopefully, in an advisory capacity, until the next conference on May 13, 14, and 15, 1969, when again it will go before the convention.

The most important thing is that all 47 eligible States have agreed on this one thing--the need to bring education to the migrant youngster as quickly as possible. This follows the mandate of the law that there shall be interstate cooperation.

#

Mrs. Ruth Graves, Director of the Migrant Division, Office of Economic Opportunity.

The Migrant Division of OEO administers programs of housing, training and rehabilitation, and child care for farm workers under Title III-B of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Unfortunately, OEO has very limited funds available for the care of children. Therefore, the ESEA Title I programs are a great asset to the entire migrant family.

Persons eligible for services from OEO migrant programs differ somewhat from those defined for services by other migrant programs. EOA Title III-B specifies that OEO will serve both migrant and seasonal farm workers. This

means that interstate and intrastate migrants and farm workers who live in a single area the year round are eligible for OEO programs. OEO has limited its services to persons who have worked in the field within the last year, who earned 50 percent of their income from that type of work, and who fall within the definition of an impoverished individual. Although this definition gives OEO a slightly different clientele from those served by the migrant education amendment to ESEA, the definitions do overlap for many individuals.

According to various statistics, there are between 4 1/2 and 9 million people who fall within the category which Title III-B seeks to serve. OEO therefore has roughly \$4 per person per annum to get these farm workers out of poverty. As you can see, the OEO migrant program is not exactly over-budgeted.

With the limited funds available, OEO had to make the decision as to where the money could be used most effectively. It was decided that funds should be concentrated on the adults and on the family as a unit. In reaching this decision, OEO was not implying that programs for children have no potential for getting people out of poverty in the long run, but that there were other funds available for the care of children. Further, OEO realized that the Nation is facing a rather severe crisis in the fields so far as migrant and seasonal farm workers are concerned. According to the President's Commission on Food and Fiber, there will be a 40-percent decline in the need for this kind of labor within the next 10 years. Thus there is likely to be an enormous number of people who will be out of work and unskilled. OEO is attempting to stem this influx of unemployed, unskilled farm workers into the ranks of unemployed and urban ghetto dwellers by providing them with upgraded skills and education.

Toward that end, family rehabilitation, education, vocational training, and housing--with related sanitation, health services, and some child care--have been the OEO's main concern.

A major emphasis of the OEO programs is coordination with programs of other agencies and of the communities. The OEO Migrant Division attempts in large part to use its funds as "seed" money to generate other services for migrant workers.

For instance, OEO has funded a number of programs of self-help housing to work in conjunction with the Farmers Home Administration's loan program for low-income families. In these programs, OEO provides the technical and administrative staff to enable farm workers to obtain loans for the construction of their own homes. There is potential in these programs for very direct coordination with the Title I programs. As the migrants who are building their own homes tend to become more stable members of their communities, their children should be involved in the ESEA Title I programs. In these communities there is also a built-in resource for parental involvement in Title I programs.

In the area of adult education--a term which OEO uses to cover training of adults from the basic education programs to teaching English to Spanish-speaking, through prevocational and skills training programs--OEO programs

emphasize the placement of farm workers into both nonfarm and up-graded agricultural jobs. In many areas, agribusiness and industry have become directly involved in the operations of these programs. OEO programs also operate in some areas in conjunction with the Office of Education's Adult Basic Education (ABE) program and with Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) programs. These programs are designed especially for heads of households and could very easily work directly in coordination with Title I programs for children.

More and more, OEO is attempting to use its funds to provide the "missing link" to services for migrants. For instance, OEO has found in some communities that farm workers could participate in other programs if they had the transportation. In those instances, OEO programs attempt to find the transportation. In others, adult farm workers could participate in training programs if they had the educational background or other supportive services OEO tries to provide these services. In several areas, OEO has worked out cooperative arrangements with other programs receiving Federal or local funds. This has been done, in fact, with Title I ESEA programs. In California, for instance, programs for young children were sponsored by a three-way funding from OEO, Title I, and State appropriations.

In terms of increased coordination with the Title I programs, there are many potential areas which could be useful. OEO agencies could be most helpful to the migrant education programs by providing outreach to the parents of the children, by explaining to the parents the advantages of enrolling their children in the Title I program, and by securing parental, as well as child, participation in the programs.

Often agencies in the community are unaware of each other and the services they are providing to the same group of people. While the funds for these programs may come from Washington, ultimately the coordination must be done at the local level. We encourage our grantees to understand the work of agencies such as those sponsoring the Title I programs and to work jointly with them. OEO is equally anxious for the Title I programs to be aware of the operations of the antipoverty programs.

OEO is undertaking a special program of educating its migrant grantees about the programs operated under Title I and, in turn, hopes that the Title I administrators in the field will make a similar effort to learn about the migrant antipoverty programs.

OEO very much supports the work of the Title I programs and looks forward to ever-increasing cooperation over the next year.

Questions Directed to Mrs. Graves:

Olen Taylor,
Arkansas:

I wondered, since you mentioned the fact that you are going to ask for a list of Title I projects, if by the same token we might get a listing of the OEO projects in this area which might be helpful to us.

Mrs. Graves:

Absolutely. We'd be delighted to give you such a list. As a matter of fact, an outline of all of our programs is now being processed. It gives a breakdown by county. We will be happy to provide these lists.

Robert Donahue,
South Dakota:

Mrs. Graves, we had contacted your office at one time regarding our program and we were told that unless we can go through a CAP agency, there is no resource. We don't happen to have a CAP agency in the area where we have the migrant program.

Mrs. Graves:

The migrant seasonal program operates directly out of Washington. We have a separate division in Washington which deals only with this question. We are authorized to enter into agreements with public and private nonprofit agencies. We do not necessarily go through the CAPs, though we occasionally have. We do have groups that are working exclusively on and with migrants, and also contacts with various State agencies to provide services.

Dr. Gloria Mattera,
New York:

I have a question concerning day care. I was wondering what OEO is planning in terms of the educational aspects of day care and also regarding the salaries of people working in day care. Are salaries set by the Office, in terms of day-care workers or another category?

Mrs. Graves:

At this moment, the people in the State of New York are regrouping all the migrant services in the State. I could not tell you at this point exactly how much will go directly into day care. Salaries are based on local comparability, usually on the State merit system criteria. In addition, we have a requirement imposed on all OEO programs that no one can be paid more than 20 percent above their previous salary.

Miss Cassandra
Stockburger, National
Committee on Education
of Migrant Children:

What is the educational component of the OEO day-care centers?

Mrs. Graves:

We require our centers to meet the State licensing requirements. Unfortunately, we end up, in many instances, with basically custodial care as opposed to the rich kind of preschool care we'd like to provide.

Miss Stockburger: There is no objection to having the educational component in these centers?

Mrs. Graves: Absolutely not.

Questions Directed to Vidal Rivera, U.S. Office of Education:

Bill Caperton,
New Mexico: We have some rather large OEO day-care centers in New Mexico in which we have placed an educational component. Would you like to elaborate on the legality of this?

Mr. Rivera: The Migrant Programs Section encourages the coordination of its services with other Federal, State, and local agencies which serve migrant families. It is permissible to provide an educational component in a day-care program, provided the educational aspect meets other State specifications, e.g., hiring of aides, administrative certification, and so forth.

#

Miss Helen Johnston, Migrant Health Activity, U.S. Public Health Service.

The Migrant Health Act, passed by Congress in 1962, is only a third of a page long, but it performs a large public service. It authorizes the Public Health Service to make grants to either private or public health organizations to pay part of the costs of a family health service clinic for improvement of migrant health conditions. The Act was originally in force for 3 years, terminating in 1965. It was extended in 1965 for another 3 years, with more than a doubling of the authorized appropriation. This year it was extended for 2 more years, and again with almost double the authorized appropriation. As Mrs. Graves pointed out, appropriation history doesn't often match the authorizations in the Act. Our history has never quite caught up with the authorization. At present, our appropriation is \$8 million, and this is the same as the appropriation in each of the 2 preceding years.

Our definition of migrant does differ from that of OEO and the Office of Education. Our definition has had to be restricted because funds are restricted. A migrant, according to us, is a person who has moved one or more times in the past two crop seasons to work in agriculture and who has moved so far that he had to establish a temporary residence away from home. We have included the dependents as well as the workers. Our estimate is about 1 million workers and dependents. When you relate that to \$8 million of the appropriation, we come up with an average per person

expenditure of about \$8. The same or similar costs for Indians under the Indian Health Service is about \$200 per person. So with our \$8 per person we are trying to do a \$200 job.

The Act did say that we pay part of the cost and what we are trying to do in every way possible is to capitalize on the programs from all agencies. We want to make the migrant seek more services, instead of avoiding them because he cannot pay or because of other fears of lack of knowledge. Also, we want planned coordination within and between geographic areas for continuity of service.

Another part of the program emphasizes the orientation of the persons who work with the program to migrants and their situation. It is part of the Act and a wise part. We soon found that many professionals in health work had had very little contact with migrants in the past. They had some cultural shock when they were sent out to the camps and found how these Americans were living. They also found they had to overcome a cultural gap, to persuade the migrants to accept modern medical care.

At present we have 116 migrant health projects in approximately 300 counties. More than 200 family health service clinics are operating in these counties. They operate all year round in the home base area; in the northern areas, they operate only during the season while the migrants are there.

We estimate, from project reports, that about one-third of the migrant workers have access to project services for at least part of the year. However, again based on the project reports, we estimate that migrants are using medical care at only about one-fifth of the rate of the general population. This utilization is not related to need; it is related to their access to care. They use dental care at about one-twenty-fifth the rate of the general population, and hospital care at one-fourth. There is a great deal of instruction needed. We have evidence that migrants receive relatively little health care. There is also a gap in service in terms of the large number of additional counties that would need to have an organized system of care if the migrants were to be assured of the level of help they need. We estimate that another 500 or more counties need to set up such a system.

There is evidence of cooperation between migrant health administrators and those who are concerned with education of migrant workers. Recently, we received from one of the larger projects an evaluation of its experience in working with Title I. It was suggested that some guidelines be established to strengthen State and local cooperation between the Title I program and the migrant health program. The evaluation report suggested two major components for the guidelines, one in the area of joint planning and the other in joint evaluation.

In the joint planning, the guideline recommendations are that, before the migrant season starts, health agencies should be involved, including not only the migrant health project but also health departments and medical societies and other groups in the community. In this joint planning, specific objectives to be achieved during the year should be agreed upon.

Also--What makes the child fit for school? How does one determine this fitness? What physical screening procedures should be used? What observation techniques might be taught teachers in order that they could readily recognize hearing problems, visual problems, impetigo, ringworm? What is the role of the school nurse in this picture?

If systematic screening is to be done as each child comes into the school, how should it be implemented? What should be the specific roles of different agencies? How can they work together? How can the children who enter school late be included?

Another area in which agreement needs to be reached is what cooperating agencies handle what type of referrals, and what procedures should be followed for referral and follow-up after the examination has been given. Then, how can the participating individuals and groups be oriented to the migrant child and to his unique situation, so that their services will be meaningful and productive? How, when, and by whom should this orientation be conducted? Are there outside consultants who could help?

In the joint planning before the season starts, one of the things to consider is how the parents can be brought into the program. What should be the content, in health education, for both child and parent? And what method for providing education should be followed?

A final thing that also must be agreed upon in advance is a simple and effective method of evaluating the achievements of the health service in relation to the objectives.

After the season, joint evaluation is recommended: To look at the achievements and the defects of the program; to review the methods that worked and those that did not; and to plan for the next season's operation with possible changes and redefinitions.

Our end objective is not just to provide health services to migrants but to bring them into full participation as members of their communities. And it's our success in this, too, that needs to be evaluated.

Questions Directed to Miss Johnston:

Bill Caperton,
New Mexico:

I'd like to ask Miss Johnston . . . Mrs. Graves cleared it up as far as contact for health in Title III-B programs are concerned, but how about migrant health? Do we go through our own State health department which has now reorganized and been combined into an HEW department or do we come directly to Washington?

Miss Johnston:

You would normally go to the State health department, which in New Mexico is now the Department of State Health and Welfare. There is another alternative. That is the regional office in Dallas.

We have two men who serve the States in that region. If you write to the regional migrant health representative, you can get the information you need.

Dr. Elizabeth Sutton,
U.S. Office of
Education:

I understand you have on your staff some health education people. Probably the State coordinators would be interested in knowing how they could get the services of health education people who can work with school people within their States, directly, on health instruction in the schools.

Miss Johnston:

We have two professional health educators on the staff in Washington. These are two consultants for the whole United States, so they have to spread themselves pretty thin. However, if you are interested in trying to develop something jointly between migrant health and education in the area of health education, we would be delighted to have a request from any of you for consultation. Again, the best routing for this would be through the migrant health representative in the regional office that serves your region.

REPORTS OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Group I

Dr. Fred Croft of Indiana, reporter.

The recommendations of Group I were as follows:

1. A discretionary fund should be set aside for the Migrant Programs Section so that it can more effectively assume the leadership role in the Title I migrant education program. This amount will be determined by the appropriate personnel.
2. A committee should be established to consider the objectives of the Title I migrant education program and the best means of evaluating them. This committee would consist of State representatives appointed by the Migrant Programs Section and experts in evaluation recommended by the States to the Migrant Programs Section.
3. The Migrant Programs Section should continue to explore the utilization of individualized instruction for the education of migrant children.
4. The Migrant Programs Section should give support and direction to the education of personnel working in programs for migrant children.

Group Concerns:

1. Definition of the migrant child. Group agreed that the definition of the migrant child should be kept flexible enough so States can use discretion in choosing participants.
2. Extended definition of the migrant child. To provide for migrant children who have stopped migrating, there must be additional funds available under the Title I migrant education program or other funding sources.
3. Summer schools. Group agreed upon the need and value of summer schools, whether they reinforce learning experiences found in the regular school year or introduce new cultural experiences. There should be more coordination among home-base and receiving States in the operation of the continuous program.

Group II

Bill Caperton of New Mexico, reporter.

Group II recommended the following:

Bilingual Approaches

1. When the child comes to school with one language, that language should be used as an instrument to communicate with him until he makes the language transition.
2. Bilingual teachers, aides, or team-teaching methods should be utilized.
3. Provisions should be made for inservice training in bilingual educational approaches for all teachers and administrative personnel.
4. Coordinators should be encouraged to participate in teacher-personnel exchange programs, providing the receiving States do not keep the teachers they borrow.
5. Migrant education programs should continue to fund bilingual and ESL programs.

Continuity of Instructional and Health Programs

1. Support should be given to the record transfer system.
2. States should set up special inservice training programs at the local level to administer or to process the record transfer system. This should be in all schools which service migrant youngsters whether they participate in Title I migrant education programs or not.
3. A letter or directive from the Office of Education or the Interstate Record Transfer Committee should be sent to the States urging them to meet personnel requirements and to set aside money to operate this activity. A technician is recommended for each State--to carry out the functions of record transfer and to see that the law is followed.

Cooperative Planning

1. An interstate committee, similar to the Interstate Record Transfer Committee, should be established to study the feasibility of establishing continuity of programs.
2. A means should be developed to compile accrued hours toward the completion of a high school diploma.

Community Involvement

1. Everyone involved in the migrant education program should reread Program Guide No. 46A on community involvement.
2. There should be strict adherence to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 particularly as it pertains to program grouping.

Group III

Pat Hogan of New York, reporter.

Group III presented the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that a committee of States be formed to study the statistical basis for the migrant education formula. The findings of this committee will be presented to all States and the national meeting in Atlantic City on May 14, 15, and 16, 1969, and the portion of the findings that are acceptable to a majority will become recommendations to the U.S. Office of Education. The committee will include the eight States with the largest migrant education allocations (Texas, Florida, California, Michigan, New York, Washington, New Jersey, and Arizona) as well as nine States with small allocations (Massachusetts, Virginia, Arkansas, Ohio, Kentucky, Missouri, Colorado, South Dakota, and Nevada).

BE IT RESOLVED that the U.S. Office of Education work to attempt to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to include appropriations earmarked for migrant education.

BE IT RESOLVED that it be recommended that the Migrant Education Amendment be amended to read, "covering children ages birth through 21."

and

WHEREAS, the education of migrant children is of primary importance to the migrant education coordinators here assembled; and,

WHEREAS, the greatest single obstacle to comprehensive educational programs with migratory children is mobility; and,

WHEREAS, this mobility of the children is caused by the continual need of families to move to find work for money to sustain their lives;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

That the migrant education coordinators here assembled are firmly committed to programs to permit families to move out of the migrant stream into the

permanent communities of their choice, where children may receive full educational opportunity; and

That the migrant education coordinators here assembled will use their power and resources actively to develop and solicit help and funds to promote these resettlement opportunities in their States and communities; and

That the migrant education coordinators assembled urge the U.S. Office of Education to assert its power and resources to permit, encourage, and develop resettlement opportunities for all migratory families.

COMMENDATIONS BY
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

John F. Hughes, Director of the Division of Compensatory Education, commended the Interstate Record Transfer Committee on its excellent work. He presented each member of the committee with a letter of commendation from Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II.

Those receiving awards were: Leo R. Lopez, California, chairman; John O. Dunn, New York; Donald R. Beaton, Michigan; Dr. Nick Rossi, Colorado; Lee C. Frasier, Texas; Charles L. Conyers, Virginia; Dewey McGowen, Jr., Connecticut; J.O. "Rocky" Maynes, Jr., Arizona; Sid Henry, Florida; and Vidal A. Rivera, Jr., Chief of the Migrant Programs Section, U.S. Office of Education.

A copy of the commendation appears in the appendix.

Mr. Hughes complimented those attending the meeting for their participation and recommendations. This meeting, he said, will serve as an aid to the Office of Education in developing the migrant program at the national level. All of the recommendations are appropriate, but Mr. Hughes could not assure everyone that his office had the power to carry them out to completion. Some of them involve legislative changes which are outside his jurisdiction. He would, however, take steps to implement the other recommendations.

Mr. Hughes said the Office of Education will continue to work on establishing programs which, in the coordinators' and the Office's minds, meet the needs and requirements of the law. It will also seek ways in which both the coordinators and OE can improve these programs.

The Atlantic City Conference scheduled for May is one which the U.S. Office of Education heartily endorses, Mr. Hughes said. His office will be glad to participate.

Appendix

LETTER FROM COMMISSIONER HOWE TO MEMBERS OF THE INTERSTATE RECORD TRANSFER COMMITTEE

December 6, 1968

Dear Mr. Lopez:

I want to take this opportunity to commend you and your co-workers for your outstanding contributions to the development of a national scholastic and health record transfer system for children of migrant agricultural workers.

If this record system is implemented as it has been outlined to me, you and other members of the Interstate Record Transfer Committee will have achieved a major breakthrough in meeting the special educational needs of migrant workers' children.

I am confident that your efforts and those of your committee colleagues will result in greatly improved educational services for the children served by programs authorized by amendments to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Many thanks for your contributions and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Harold Howe II
U.S. Commissioner of Education

Mr. Leo R. Lopez
Chairman
Interstate Committee on Migrant
Student Records
State Department of Education
Sacramento, California 95814

Similar letters to:

Mr. Donald R. Beaton
Administrator, Michigan Migrant
Program, Title I, ESEA
State Department of Education
Lansing, Michigan 48902

Mr. Charles L. Conyers
Assistant Supervisor, Title I, ESEA
State Board of Education
Richmond, Virginia 23216

Mr. John O. Dunn
Supervisor, Elementary Education
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224

Mr. Lee C. Frasier
Director, Migrant & Preschool
Education
Texas Education Agency
Austin, Texas 78711

Mr. Sid Henry
Consultant, Migrant Education
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Mr. J.O. "Rocky" Maynes, Jr.
Director, Migrant Child Education
State Department of Public Instruction
Phoenix, Arizona 85013

Mr. Dewey McGowen, Jr.
Consultant, Title I, ESEA
State Department of Education
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

Mr. Vidal A. Rivera, Jr., Chief
Migrant Programs Section
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dr. Nick Rossi
Consultant, Title I, ESEA
Education of Migrant Children
State Department of Education
Denver, Colorado 80203

LETTER OF INVITATION TO CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

Dear:

The Office of Education is sponsoring a conference on migrant education. We are inviting those persons who are directly responsible for administering the migrant program authorized by Title I, ESEA, P.L. 89-10, as amended by P.L. 89-750. This conference has as its primary objective to find ways to improve the effectiveness and quality of educational programs for migrant children by emphasizing the role of the State administrator.

Prior to the 1967 authorization by Congress of the Title I, ESEA, migrant program, a series of regional meetings were held for State Title I Coordinators to outline the intent and implementation of this timely legislation. We realize that since that time, many new coordinators and administrators have been appointed by State departments of education to assume the responsibility of implementing their migrant programs. Therefore, it is appropriate at this time to meet with all of the coordinators and review the legislation and the gains that have been made in the field of migrant education and discuss how the program can be refined.

The specific objectives of the conference will be to:

1. Discuss the present legislation and clarify its intent.
2. Review State administrative requirements and discuss methods by which we may strengthen State responsibilities.
3. Improve interstate cooperation and involvement as it pertains to the migrant child and his family.
4. Promote more extensive interagency cooperation and participation by familiarizing the States with those agencies having responsibilities for the migrant family.
5. Develop practical approaches and techniques involved with the implementation of an interstate transfer of records system as proposed by the Interstate Record Transfer Committee.

-34-

The conference will be held at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, 2600 Woodley Road, NW., Washington, D.C. It will begin on December 4, 1968, at 3:00 p.m. and will conclude the afternoon of December 6, 1968.

Travel expenses, in connection with this conference, are properly authorized in the State Title I administrative funds.

Questions concerning this conference should be directed to Mr. Vidal A. Rivera, Jr., Chief, Migrant Programs Section, Division of Compensatory Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202. Telephone: (202) 962-3118.

I hope you or your representative will be able to attend.

Sincerely yours,

B. Alden Lillywhite
Deputy Associate Commissioner for
Elementary and Secondary Education

cc:

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
TITLE I, ESEA MIGRANT COORDINATORS MEETING
Sheraton-Park Hotel
Washington, D.C.
December 4 - 6, 1968

Alabama

Mr. Edward A. Spear
Assistant Coordinator, Title I, ESEA
State Department of Education
Montgomery, Ala. 36104

Arizona

Mr. J.O. "Rocky" Haynes, Jr.
Director, Migrant Child Education
State Department of Public Instruction
1333 West Camelback Road - Suite 105
Phoenix, Ariz. 85013

Mr. Ernest Y. Flores
Ass't. Director, Migrant Child Education
State Department of Public Instruction
1333 West Camelback Road - Suite 105
Phoenix, Ariz. 85013

Arkansas

Mr. Winford Miller
Supervisor of Special Programs, Title I
State Department of Education
7509 Cantrell Road
Little Rock, Ark. 72201

Mr. Olen Taylor
Director of Finances for Federal Programs
State Department of Education
7509 Cantrell Road
Little Rock, Ark. 72201

California

Mr. Eugene DeG. Hackett
President
Hypermetrics Inc.
400 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, Calif. 95814

Colorado

Dr. Nick Rossi
Consultant, Title I, ESEA
Education of Migrant Children
State Department of Education
Denver, Colo. 80203

Delaware

Mr. William Corkle
Coordinator of Title I, ESEA
State Department of Public Instruction
Dover, Del. 19901

Florida

Mr. James F. Brannigan
President
American Development Corporation
1155 SW. 5th Street
Boca Raton, Fla. 33432

Mr. Arthur Collier
Consultant, Education for Migrant Children
State Department of Education
219 West Jefferson Street
Tallahassee, Fla. 36204

Mrs. Eloyce Combs
Consultant, Education for Migrant Children
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Fla. 36204

Mrs. Minnie Fields
Coordinator, Migrant Program
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Fla. 36204

Mr. Ken Gordon
Ass't. Director, Migrant Center
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Fla. 33432

Mr. Dale Hilburn
Consultant, Education for Migrant Children
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Fla. 36204

Mr. Dennis Hooker
Consultant, Migrant Center
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Fla. 33432

Dr. Jack Kleinert
Director, Migrant Survey Center
University of Miami
Coral Gables, Fla. 33146

Mr. Hal Lewis
Administrator of Migrant Program
Federal-State Relations
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Fla. 36204

Mr. Joel Murphree
Consultant, Education for Migrant Children
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Fla. 36204

Mr. George Sneller
Program Accountant
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Fla. 36204

Mr. William Stone
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity
Broward County
Fort Lauderdale, Fla. 33301

Dr. Lester E. Tuttle, Jr.
Director, Migrant Center
Florida Atlantic University
Boca Raton, Fla. 33432

Mr. Frank Warriner
Assistant Director, Migrant Project
Southeastern Education Laboratory
5825 Sunset Drive - Suite 304
South Miami, Fla. 33143

Mr. John Wheeler
Coordinator of Title I, ESEA
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Fla. 36204

Miss Betty Wilkes
Consultant, Education for Migrant Children
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Fla. 36204

Georgia

Miss Susie Underwood
Consultant, Elementary Education
State Department of Education
Atlanta, Ga. 30334

Idaho

Mr. D.L. Hicks
Director of Title I, ESEA
State Department of Education
State House
Boise, Idaho 83701

Mrs. Ardis M. Snyder
Consultant, Title I, ESEA
State Department of Education
Boise, Idaho 83701

Indiana

Dr. Fred A. Croft
Director, Migrant Education
State Department of Public Instruction
309 West Washington Street
Indianapolis, Ind. 46204

Mr. Arlie Whitaker
Principal
Sunman Elementary School
Sunman, Ind. 47041

Iowa

Mr. James Dottenfield
Title I Consultant
State Department of Public Instruction
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Mr. Ron Huff
Consultant, Title I, ESEA
State Department of Public Instruction
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Kansas

Mr. Henry A. Parker
Coordinator of Title I, ESEA
State Department of Public Instruction
Kansas State Education Building
120 East 10th Street
Topeka, Kans. 66612

Mr. James Fish
Executive Director
Migrants, Inc.
459 Rice Street
St. Paul, Minn. 55103

Mississippi

Mr. A.J. Comfort
Assistant Coordinator, Title I, ESEA
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 771
Jackson, Miss. 39205

Missouri

Mr. John T. Lawrence
Coordinator of P.L. 89-10
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 480
Jefferson City, Mo. 65101

Dr. Harold Woods
Director
Migratory Children Education
and Record Center
Southeast Missouri State College
Cape Girardeau, Mo. 63701

Montana

Mr. Loran Frazier
Director, Migrant Children Program
State Department of Public Instruction
Helena, Mont. 59601

Mr. Thad Harris
Ass't. Director, Migrant Children Program
State Department of Public Instruction
Helena, Mont. 59601

Nebraska

Mr. Larry Vontz
Director of Title I, ESEA
State Department of Education
State Capitol Building
Lincoln, Nebr. 68509

Mr. Linden Johnson
Consultant, Title I, ESEA
State Department of Education
Lincoln, Nebr. 68509

New Hampshire

Mr. Keith Hanscome
Consultant, Title I, ESEA
State Department of Education
Concord, N.H. 03301

New Jersey

Mr. Westry Horne, Director
Educational Program for Seasonal
and Migrant Families
State Department of Education
225 West State Street
Trenton, N.J. 08625

New Mexico

Mr. Bill Caperton
Director, Migrant Program, Title I
State Department of Education
Santa Fe, N. Mex. 87501

New York

Mr. John O. Dunn
Chief
Bureau of Migrant Education
State Education Department
Albany, N.Y. 12224

Mr. Pat F. Hogan
Associate, Migrant Education
State Education Department
Albany, N.Y. 12225

Miss Cassandra Stockburger
Director, National Committee on the
Education of Migrant Children
145 East 32nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10016

Dr. Gloria Mattera
Director
New York State Center for Migrant Studies
Geneseo, N.Y. 14454

North Carolina

Mr. Y.A. Taylor
Supervisor, Program Development
State Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, N.C. 27602

Mr. Frank Toliver
Supervisor, Secondary Education
State Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, N.C. 27602

Mr. Carlton Willis
Data Processing Manager
State Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, N.C. 27602

North Dakota

Mr. Warren Pederson
Coordinator of Title I, ESEA
State Department of Public Instruction
State Capitol Building
Bismarck, N.Dak. 58501

Ohio

Mr. James W. Miller
Section Chief, Special Programs
State Department of Education
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Oklahoma

Mr. Harvey Ross
Director
Oklahoma Migrant Program, Title I, ESEA
State Department of Education
Oklahoma City, Okla. 73105

Oregon

Mr. Elton D. Minkler
Supervisor, Migrant Education
Oregon Board of Education
311 Public Service Building
Salem, Ore. 97310

Pennsylvania

Mr. John Hyams
Specialist, Migrant Programs
State Department of Public Instruction
Harrisburg, Pa. 17126

Mr. Matthew Harris, Jr.
Systems Analyst
State Department of Public Instruction
Harrisburg, Pa. 17126

South Carolina

Mr. Grady E. Sanford
Project Supervisor, Title I, ESEA
State Department of Education
Columbia, S.C. 29201

South Dakota

Mr. Robert E. Donahue
Ass't. Administrator, Title I, ESEA
State Department of Public Instruction
Pierre, S.Dak 57501

Tennessee

Mr. Ralph E. Naylor
Supervisor, Title I Migrant Program
State Department of Education
Nashville, Tenn. 37219

Mr. Ervin H. Thomas
Coordinator of Title I, ESEA
State Department of Education
Nashville, Tenn. 37219

Texas

Mr. Lee C. Frasier, Director
Migrant and Preschool Programs
Division of Compensatory Education
Texas Education Agency
Austin, Tex. 78711

Mr. Tom Anderson
Ass't. Director, Migrant and Preschool Programs
Division of Compensatory Education
Texas Education Agency
Austin, Tex. 78711

Utah

Mr. Kerry Nelson
Assistant Director, Title I, ESEA
Office of the Superintendent
of Public Instruction
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Vermont

Mr. Walter D. Gallagher
Coordinator of Title I, ESEA
State Department of Education
State Office Building
Montpelier, Vt. 05602

Virginia

Mr. Charles L. Conyers
Assistant Supervisor, Title I, ESEA
State Board of Education
Richmond, Va. 23216

Mr. R.P. Stenzhorn
Director of Federal Programs
Virginia Beach Public Schools
Box 6038
Virginia Beach, Va. 23456

Mr. Joseph P. Kyle
Director, County Testing Program
Assistant Director of Federal Programs
Roanoke County Public Schools
Salem, Va. 24153

Mr. Franklin D.W. Carr
Principal
T.C. Walker Junior High School
Accomack, Va. 23301

Washington

Mr. James O. Click
Supervisor, Migrant Programs
Office of the State Superintendent
of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building
Olympia, Wash. 98501

Mr. Dale Farris
Consultant, Title I, ESEA
Office of the State Superintendent
of Public Instruction
Olympia, Wash. 98501

West Virginia

Mr. James C. Sovine
Assistant Administrator, Title I, ESEA
State Department of Education
State Capitol Building
Charleston, W.Va. 25305

Wisconsin

Mr. C. F. Baime
Supervisor, Title I, ESEA
• State Department of Public Instruction
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wis. 53703

U.S. Office of Education

B. Alden Lillywhite
John F. Hugies
Genevieve O. Dane
Vidal A. Rivera, Jr.
Joseph P. Bertoglio
Randall F. Clemens
David G. Webb, Jr.
Lila Shapiro
Linda A. Rebucci
George Haney
Elizabeth Sutton
Yolando Leo
Lois Schlar
Dina Klugman
Martha Fiedler
Juan Ibarra
Albert Riendeau

-45-

Barbara Kemp

Webster Tenney

Rudy Munis

Staff of Sen. Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor

Mr. Thomas Boyd
Legislative Assistant

Mr. Boren Chertkov
Associate Counsel to the Subcommittee

Mrs. Mary Hauser
Secretary

Other Government Agencies

Miss Helen Johnston, Chief
Migrant Health Activity
Public Health Service
800 North Quincy Street
Arlington, Va. 22203

Mrs. Ruth Graves
Chief, Migrant Division
Office of Special Programs
Office of Economic Opportunity
Washington, D.C. 20506